

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *VOLUTA EPISCOPALIS* LINNAEUS, 1758. Z.N.(S.) 1728

(see volume 22, pages 355–356, volume 23, pages 80–81)

By Myra Keen (Department of Geology, Stanford University,
California 94305, U.S.A.)

Although the selection of *Mitra episcopalis* in preference to *Mitra mitra* Linnaeus would be congruent with a number of other I.C.Z.N. decisions (e.g., *Modiolus* Lamarck, 1799, vs. *Valsella* Scopoli, 1777, and *Turbinella* Lamarck, 1799 vs. *Xancus* Röding, 1798), in which preponderant 19th century usage was a deciding factor, I have the impression that Coan (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 22 : 355–6) in presenting some alternatives, was more concerned with getting a judicial opinion than in arguing the merits of either choice.

Heppell (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 23 : 81) has alluded to a correlative problem, the supposed priority of the generic name *Mitra* Röding over *Mitra* Lamarck. Coan has discussed this in a paper subsequent to his petition (Coan, 1966, *Veliger* 9 (2) : 130, footnote). The exact date and also the authorship of the nominal taxon *Mitra* therefore should be clarified. Cernohorsky (1965, *Veliger* 8 (2) : 81, 159) would give priority to *Mitra* Röding on the basis of a date (September 10, 1798) in the introduction to the "Museum Boltenianum", a sale catalogue. It seems generally agreed that *Mitra* Lamarck dates from September 21, 1798, the last day of the year "VI" of the French Republic, under Article 21 (b) (ii) of the International Code. It seems to me that this principle should also apply to the Röding work, dating it from December 31, 1798. There is no date on the title page of the "Museum Boltenianum", and the date "September 10, 1798" appears only in a preface or introduction prepared by a Professor Lichtenstein, who had assisted Röding in the readying of Bolten's manuscript catalogue for use in the sale of his collection. Is it not more likely that this was the date when the list was ready to send to the printer rather than the date when it became available to the public? Supporting evidence for this view can be gleaned from a paper by Rehder (*Nautilus* 59 (2) : 50–52, 1944), who has pointed out contemporary mention of the Bolten catalogue. In the issue of January 16, 1799 of the *Intelligenzblatt der Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung*, columns 39–40, there is a review of the work and a statement as to its preparation, that Röding and Lichtenstein had edited Bolten's catalogue and "have then had it printed". "Amateurs outside of the city may... receive the list for 6 shillings." This implies a very recent appearance of the work. Rehder concludes that it probably had appeared in November or December of 1798. Invoking of Article 21 (b) (ii) would thus seem logical.

Although the part of the *Encyclopédie Méthodique* in which the name *Mitra* appeared on several plate captions (credited to Lamarck as editor) contains several other generic names, only one had not previously been validated—*Terebellum*. It, like *Mitra*, also was listed in the Museum Boltenianum. Whether dated from Röding (*Mus. Bol.* : 135) or from Lamarck (*Encycl. Méth.* : pl. 360), the type species is the same—*Bulla terebellum* Linnaeus, 1767, by absolute tautonymy. The type species for *Mitra* also remains unchanged, whichever author is accepted, having been fixed by subsequent designation of Montfort, 1810. Thus, a decision to concede priority to the Lamarckian names would not involve change in concept of any generic name and would involve change of authorship for only the two, *Mitra* and *Terebellum*.